9555 HILLWOOD DRIVE, 2ND FLOOR

HOLLAND & HART LLP

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89134

10482412\_2

Electronically Filed 12/22/2017 1:29 PM Steven D. Grierson

Case Number: A-17-763456-C

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

The Court having considered the pleadings and documentary evidence submitted by the parties and the arguments of counsel, and finding that Plaintiffs have demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits and a reasonable probability that the conduct of the Board, if allowed to continue, will cause irreparable harm to Plaintiffs, this Court hereby makes the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and orders as follows:

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

#### A. Likelihood of Success on the Merits.

Plaintiffs have demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits because Spring 1. Valley Pharmacy has not violated the Board's June 9, 2017 Findings of Fact, Conclusion of Law and Orders (the "Board Orders") in Board Case Nos. 16-015 and 16-022 (the "Board Actions"). Therefore, there are no grounds for the Board to pursue discipline against Spring Valley Pharmacy on that basis.

## Spring Valley Pharmacy's Change of Managing Pharmacist.

- 2. The Board Orders required Plaintiffs to comply with all federal and state statutes and regulations regarding the practice of pharmacy. Defendants allege that Plaintiffs violated NRS 639.220 by operating without a managing pharmacist.
- Spring Valley Pharmacy was unaware that its managing pharmacist resigned 3. without notice, and further unaware that its managing pharmacist considered his resignation to be effective retroactively.
- Spring Valley Pharmacy immediately replaced its managing pharmacist as soon 4. as possible.
- 5. Therefore, Spring Valley Pharmacy has not violated the Board Orders with respect to its change of managing pharmacist.

### Monitoring of Spring Valley Pharmacy.

- The Board Orders state that Spring Valley Pharmacy shall engage and participate 6. in an independent remediation and compliance monitoring program designed by the independent monitor Affiliated Monitors, Inc. ("Affiliated Monitors").
  - Spring Valley Pharmacy complied with the Board Orders by immediately 7. Page 2 of 7

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

contacting and working with Affiliated Monitors to commence the independent remediation and compliance monitoring program.

- After months of diligently corresponding with Affiliated Monitors, Spring Valley 8. Pharmacy executed the monitoring agreement and business associate agreement on October 12, 2017.
- Spring Valley Pharmacy is ready and willing to comply with the Affiliated 9. Monitors independent remediation and compliance monitoring program as soon as the Board so authorizes commencement of such a program.
- Therefore, Spring Valley Pharmacy has not violated the Board Orders with 10. respect to its engagement and participation in an independent remediation and compliance monitoring program.

#### Ownership of Spring Valley Pharmacy.

- State statutes and regulations require that a pharmacy notify the Board of any 11. change in beneficial ownership of the pharmacy.
- Spring Valley Pharmacy is currently owned by Spring Valley Pharmacy, a 12. Nevada limited liability company.
- In 2010, Spring Valley Pharmacy, a Nevada corporation, converted to Spring 13. Valley Pharmacy, a Nevada limited liability company, pursuant to NRS 92A.250(3).
  - Although conversion has occurred, there is no transfer of ownership. 14.
- Pursuant to NRS 92A.250(3)(b), a conversion is a continuation of the existence of 15. the constituent entity.
- The conversion of Spring Valley Pharmacy, a Nevada corporation, to Spring 16. Valley Pharmacy, a Nevada limited liability company, is a continuation of the constituent entity, and therefore not a transfer of ownership.
- As there has been no transfer of ownership of Spring Valley Pharmacy, Spring 17. Valley Pharmacy has not violated the Board Orders with respect to its reporting of its ownership to the Board.

111

# 18.

New Accusation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- On November 14, 2017, the Board filed a new accusation under Board case no. 17-115 ("Accusation") asserting new allegations against Spring Valley Pharmacy.
- The allegations in the new Accusation do not constitute violations of the Board 19. Orders, and therefore do not constitute grounds for restricting Spring Valley Pharmacy's access to its controlled substances or instituting involuntary closure proceedings against Spring Valley Pharmacy.
  - The Board's Conduct Would Cause Irreparable Harm for Which B. Compensatory Damages Are an Inadequate Remedy.
- The Board's conduct has caused and would continue to cause irreparable harm for 20. which compensatory damages are an inadequate remedy.
- From October 18, 2017 to November 6, 2017, the Board restricted Spring Valley 21. Pharmacy's access to its controlled substances and threatened to close Spring Valley Pharmacy within thirty (30) days.
- 22. From October 18, 2017 to November 6, 2017, Spring Valley Pharmacy could not dispense controlled substances to its customers or order controlled substances.
- Both the restriction of access to Spring Valley Pharmacy's controlled substances 23. and threatened closure of Spring Valley Pharmacy results in interference with the business's operation and profits, loss of customers, and ultimately threatens the very existence of the business.

#### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

A preliminary injunction is available if an applicant can show a likelihood of 24. success on the merits and a reasonable probability that the non-moving party's conduct, if allowed to continue, will cause irreparable harm for which compensatory damage is an inadequate remedy. Boulder Oaks Cmty. Ass'n v. B & J Andrew Enters., LLC, 125 Nev. 397, 403, 215 P.3d 27, 31 (2009) (citing NRS 33.010); Dangberg Holdings Nev., L.L.C. v. Douglas County, 115 Nev. 129, 142, 978 P.2d 311, 319 (1999) (citing Pickett v. Comanche Constr., Inc., 108 Nev. 422, 426, 836 P.2d 42, 44 (1992)). The Court may properly enter an injunction to

Page 4 of 7

10482412 2

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

restore the status quo and to undo wrongful conditions. Memory Gardens of Las Vegas, Inc. v. Pet Ponderosa Memorial Gardens, Inc., 88 Nev. 1, 3, 492 P.2d 123, 124 (1972); Leonard v. Stoebling, 102 Nev. 543, 550, 728 P.2d 1358, 1363 (1986). A plaintiff suffers irreparable harm when acts committed without just cause unreasonably interfere with a business or destroy its credit and profits by, for example, interfering with the business's operation, creating public confusion, infringing on goodwill, or damaging reputation in the eyes of creditors. See Sobol v. Capital Management Consultants, Inc., 102 Nev. 444, 446, 726 P.2d 335, 337 (1986).

- Here, Plaintiffs have shown a likelihood of success on the merits because there 25. has been no violation of the Board Orders, including the following:
  - a. With respect to the change of Spring Valley Pharmacy's managing pharmacist;
  - b. With respect to Spring Valley Pharmacy's participation in a monitoring program administered by Affiliated Monitors;
  - c. With respect to the notification to the Board of a change of beneficial ownership since no such ownership change occurred; and
  - d. With respect to the new allegations in the Accusation--none of these new allegations constitute a violation of the Board Orders justifying the Board's conduct.
- The Board's conduct in restricting Spring Valley Pharmacy's access to its 26. controlled substances, threatening to close Spring Valley Pharmacy, placing Nguyen's name on its meeting agenda, and contacting Nguyen personally result in irreparable harm for which compensatory damages are an inadequate remedy.
- If unrestrained, the Board's conduct in restricting Spring Valley Pharmacy's 27. access to its controlled substances and threatening to close Spring Valley Pharmacy within thirty (30) days interferes with Spring Valley Pharmacy's business and profits, drives away customers, and ultimately threatens its very existence, making monetary damages or other remedies at law inadequate to redress Spring Valley Pharmacy's injuries.

ACCORDINGLY, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction is hereby GRANTED in part and DENIED in part. The Motion is GRANTED as to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

the Board's conduct against Spring Valley Pharmacy and contact with Nguyen personally. The Motion is DENIED as to the Board's contact with Nguyen in her capacity as owner, to the extent the Board has jurisdiction over Nguyen as the owner of Spring Valley Pharmacy. The Board is hereby RESTRAINED and ENJOINED from the following:

- preventing Spring Valley Pharmacy's access to its stores of controlled substances except to the extent such action is justified by violations occurring after the date of this order;
- 2. involuntarily closing Spring Valley Pharmacy except to the extent such action is justified by violations occurring after the date of this order;
- placing Nguyen's name (in her personal capacity) on the Agenda for upcoming 3. Board meetings or otherwise requiring her to appear in her personal capacity before the Board; and
  - 4. contacting Nguyen (in her personal capacity) except through her counsel.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiffs, having already posted with the clerk of this court a bond in the sum of \$500.00 for payment of such cost of damages as may be incurred or suffered by the Board if found to have been wrongfully enjoined or restrained by this Order, shall not be required to post any additional bond.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Preliminary Injunction shall be considered effective as of November 21, 2017 at 9:30 a.m.

Page 6 of 7

10482412 2

9555 HILLWOOD DRIVE, 2ND FLOOR

HOLLAND & HART LLP

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89134

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Board's motion to strike the declaration of Mr. Martin Chibueze, attached as Exhibit 21 to Plaintiffs' supplemental briefing, is hereby DENIED. The testimony of Mr. Chibueze is admissible and no other contradictory evidence has been proffered.

DATED this 215 day of December, 2017

DISTRICT JUDGE

#### **Paul Edwards**

From:

Yenh Long

Sent:

Wednesday, December 27, 2017 9:18 AM

To:

Paul Edwards

Subject:

RE: Dr. Hardy's Request

Attachments:

DATA Waiver Providers 12.27.2017.xlsx; Methadone and Buprenorphine

Prescriptions.xlsx; DATA Waiver, MAT, OTP Information.docx

Hi Paul,

I think we were able to answer all of the questions for Dr. Hardy (see third attachment). Most of the credit goes to Stephanie Woodard. Do you mind sending it out to him? Or we can send to Dave to send to Hardy?

Thank you, Yenh

From: Yenh Long

Sent: Wednesday, December 27, 2017 7:51 AM

To: Paul Edwards

Subject: Dr. Hardy's Request

Hi Paul,

So far this is what I am able to gather:

- 1. How does one find a clinic? A patient seeking treatment may find a **buprenorphine** treatment provider by visiting <a href="https://www.samhsa.gov/medication-assisted-treatment/physician-program-data/treatment-physician-locator?field-bup-physician-us-state-value=NV">https://www.samhsa.gov/medication-assisted-treatment/physician-program-data/treatment-physician-locator?field-bup-physician-us-state-value=NV</a>. This list does not contain methadone clinics.
- 2. How many have waivers? See first attachment. This was downloaded from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) website. This list contains 222 providers. Practitioners are added to this list when they contact SAMHSA to increase the number of patient's they can treat with MAT. This may not be a complete list.
- 3. Number of Suboxone or buprenorphine prescriptions and methadone prescriptions? The data is in the second attachment. FYI, we cannot tease out whether the prescriptions were prescribed for pain or for addiction.

Other questions I am unable to answer and hopefully Stephanie will have the answers to are:

- 4. How many are using their waiver to treat patients with addiction?
- 5. How many methadone clinics in Northern and Southern Nevada? How many people are in these clinics?
- 6. How does a patient find a methadone clinic to treat their addiction?
- 7. How many practitioners are treating or have the ability to treat 30 patients? How many are treating or have the ability to treat 100 patients. How many can prescribe to over 100 patients? How many can are treating or have the ability to treat 275 patients.

Yenh Long, Pharm.D., BCACP Nevada Prescription Monitoring Program

Email: ylong@pharmacy.nv.gov

431 W. Plumb Ln Reno, NV 89509 Ph: 775-687-5694 Fax: 775-687-5161 This information is provided as a courtesy on behalf of the Nevada State Board of Pharmacy. This information does not constitute legal advice and does not override the specific provisions of Nevada law as applied to a particular set of facts.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message and any accompanying documents are intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. They may contain information that is proprietary, privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure under applicable Federal or State law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you are strictly prohibited from reading, using, sharing or copying this communication or its contents. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and destroy the original transmission. Thank you.